DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 972 SP 030 359

AUTHOR Harrington, Helen L.
TITLE Reform in Teacher Education: Process to Product.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Change Strategies; Decision Making; *Educational Change; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Evaluation; *Organizational Change; Organizational Objectives; *Policy Formation; Program Implementation; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

Recommendations of a task force, directed to study ways to upgrade teacher preparation programs to make the course of study more rigorous and effective, became mandatory for constituent institutions once they were adopted by the Board of Governors and the General Assembly of a southeastern state. This provided an opportunity to study the process of change in higher education and teacher education in particular. Seventeen specific recommendations were set forth. This study examined the response of one institution of higher education to these recommendations for change in the preparation of teachers. The change process included the formulation of policy, its adoption, implementation and institutionalization. The study focused on the formulation of policy as an aspect of organizational change and three questions are discussed: (1) how policy is formulated in higher education; (2) how the complex forces (subsystems) within the organization and external to the organization interact with the policy formulation process; and (3) how characteristics of higher education influence the process, if at all. (JD)

REFORM IN TEACHER EDUCATION: PROCESS TO PRODUCT

HELEN L. HARRINGTON
EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, April, 1988

Introduction

Beginning with A Nation at Risk (1983), education has been inundated by calls for reform. Initially the public schools were indicted as the primary contributing factor in the failure to educate a significant proportion of the students. Attention then focused on schools, colleges and departments of education as a major contributing factor in the failure of the schools. Attention has now shifted to the university and its responsibility for the failure of the public school system. This sequence highlights the fact that education is one system, as Hodgkinson (1986) so cogently points out, what occurs in one component is related to each other component. Increasingly what is being discussed is not the past failures of the schools as much as the need for a fundamental change in our approach to schooling. There is a perceived need, by some, for schools not just to prepare students for the knowledge age but for schools to serve as agents of social change (Popkewitz, 1987). To fullfill either or both of these functions teachers must be educated differently than they have been. This implies the joint responsibility of schools, colleges and departments of education and the institutions of which they are a part.

Most states have responded to the demands for change in some way. Some have commissioned reports, some institutions of higher education within various states have responded individually by re-examining both their professional programs and their undergraduate programs, and some state legislatures are taking an increasingly more active role in higher education. Some states have already begun to initiate change in the way universities and colleges educate teachers. As an example, in 1985 the "General Assembly directed the Board of Governors of. . . [one of the university systems in the southeast] to establish a Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers. . . and to report the findings and recommendations of its study to the 1987 Session of the General Assembly." The task force was directed to study, among other issues, ways to upgrade teacher preparation programs to make the course of study more rigorous and more effective. The completed task force report was reviewed and adopted by the Board of Governors at its November 14, 1986 meeting and referred by them to the 1987 General Assembly. The General Assembly, in turn, adopted and funded components of the report. Individual universities within the state are developing procedures to implement the mandates, which the recommendations became for the constituent institutions once they were adopted by the Board of Governors. This provided an opportunity to study the process of change in higher education and teacher education in particular. The recommendations in the report are designated as either the responsibility of the Board of Governors, institutions of higher education or the state department of public instruction.

The recommendations affecting institutions of higher education within the state included the following:

That all undergraduate teacher education students in early childhood education, elementary education, middle grades education, special education, and all other education degree programs also complete a second major in one of the basic academic disciplines or an interdisciplinary major.

That all undergraduate students preparing for teaching in the secondary schools (grades 9-12) complete a major in one or more of the basic academic disciplines as well as the necessary professional training. The professional training could be accomplished in specially designed fifth-year programs, M.A.T. programs, other variations of current professional secondary teacher preparation programs, or undergraduate minors.

That all specially designed undergraduate courses in the basic fields of study offered only for education majors be eliminated.

That formal admission to undergraduate teacher education programs be granted only after at least four semesters or two academic years of full-time study or completion of the required general studies program.

That a minimum overall grade point average in general studies courses of 2.50 on a 4.00 point scale , by the end of the fourth full semester of study, be established as a requirement for admission to teacher education programs. This should be required beginning with entering freshman in the fall of 1988.

That procedures be developed which assess aptitude for teaching to assist admissions, counseling personnel, and faculty in the selection and advisement of prospective teacher education students.

That there be a strenthening of the professional knowledge core curriculum in the undergraduate education major. The professional core should include but not be limited to:

** history, philosophy, sociology of education
** learning theory and child development
** computer and technology applications
** diagnostic teaching and testing
** classroom research methods and research utilization
** parent counseling and classroom behavior management
** cultural diversity
** special educational needs of exceptional children

That greater use be made of the summer periods after the sophmore, junior and senior years of college when many teacher education students can undertake paid supervised teaching activities in selected public school summer programs offered by local school systems under the Basic Education Program.

That a strong supervised teaching experience take place in the first year or two of full-time professional teaching in the schools in addition to that required in the current teacher education programs.

That emphasis be placed, in the professional training of prospective teachers and in the continuing professional education, on techniques and methods for motivating students to learn and to achieve.

That there be cooperative development of one- and two-year clinical teaching programs in the public schools, such programs to be limited to colleges and school systems with adequate resources and commitments for conducting effective teacher education programs.

That the capacity of colleges and universities to implement the Quality Assurance Program be strengthened by the provision of new resources to provide additional administrative personnel and support resources required to meet new standards for certification and reporting requirements. Such action would help assure more effective administrative operations in Schools and Departments of Education resulting in more effective use of instructional faculty.

That all "methods faculty" be certified to teach in the areas for which they are preparing or supervising prospective classroom teachers and regularly work with teachers in the public schools.

That a program of school-based research be established that would enable school and college faculty members to collaborate on projects of mutual interest and need.

That an organized program of public service and technical assistance be devised that would provide systematic access by public schools to consultation and advice that is available from members of college faculties.

That a Distinguished Scholars Fund be established to bring outstanding visiting scholars to education faculties and that resources be provided to attract promising young education faculty members to institutions in the state.

That each education faculty include adequate numbers of competent, experienced school teachers who make up a paid "clinical faculty" who continue to teach full- or part-time in the schools and who have a major responsibility for the methods courses, student supervision and professional portions of the teacher preparation program.

This study sought to examine the response of one institution of higher education to these recommendations for change in the preparation of teachers. A case study approach was used to examine the change process. The change process includes the formulation of policy, its adoption, implementation and institutionalization. This study focused on the formulation of policy as an aspect of organizational change. It sought to answer three question: (1) how policy is formulated in higher education; (2) how the complex forces (subsystems) within the organization and external to the organization interact with the policy formulation process; and (3) how characteristics of higher education influence the process, if at all. The context for change will now be discussed.

The Context for Change

Perhaps at no time in the history of education has higher education had the concomitant demand and knowledge to make significant changes in how teachers are educated. The demands for changes in how teachers are educated are based, in part, on a plethora of evidence that supports the fact that schools have not kept pace with the knowledge age. Students are not developing the skills, understanding or ability to function in an ever changing workplace. The schools are not preparing them for the environment in which they will work and live. This lack of preparation is reflected in the nation's loss of equity in the world market (Carnegie Report, 1986) . The demands of the future must be met in today's schools. Concurrently the needs of today must be met in today's schools. Schools must provide a high quality, equitable education for students. As a society we can no longer afford to educate only a percentage of our students well. Our survival depends on an educated populace. Hardly a new idea but perhaps never so critical an idea. Dissatisfaction with schools cannot be denied.

Teacher educators, both individually and collectively, are also examining their programs in reaction to this growing dissatisfaction. As the Holmes Group report (1986) indicates, "[w]e came together because we knew that our schools and universities were not doing well in teacher education, and because we hoped to improve. We have probed the problems and explored remedies. This has never been easy, and often it has been painful. Pursuing the shortcomings of one's own profession, and one's own institutions, is difficult at best" (p.3). But as Wildavsky (1979) so clearly explicates, the first step in the correction of the errors in any organization is the identification of those errors.

Evidence supports the concern that something is wrong with the educational enterprise. Certainly one of the most crucial factors in the success of schooling is the quality and capability of the teachers in our schools. The external environment, through a multitude of reform reports, indicates that schools, colleges and departments of education are not meeting the needs of the public nor are they prepared to meet future needs. Whether these perceptions are correct or not, teacher education and higher education are increasingly faced with demands to change.

A crucial question is, regardless of the demands for change, should teacher education change and, if so, what should these changes be? Organizational change is an extremely costly and time consuming process that "costs a fortune and takes forever" (Deal and Kennedy,1982, p.163). To ignore the costs, both human and organizational, is irresponsible (Herriot and Gross, 1979). Change threatens cultures. "People form strong attatchments to . . . all the symbols and settings of the work place. Change strips down these relationships and leaves employees confused, insecure, and often angry. . . . Because of these cultural barriers to change, effecting real and lasting change is time-consuming, costly, difficult, and risky - in short, not always a good idea" (Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p.157). Change in public institutions is particularly difficult because of the number of legitimate constituencies that must be considered An American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education task force indicated that schools, colleges, and departments of education share responsibility for teacher education with at least the following: legislatures, professional organizations, state departments of education, elementary and secondary schools, local school boards, testing agencies, accrediting agencies and citizens (Branch, 1984). The goals of these constituencies may be different from redirected internal organizational goals of departments, schools and colleges of education and thereby confound change efforts and make them even more costly and difficult.

But change is a constant. "One thing that is new is the prevalence of newness, the changing scale and scope of change itself, so that the world alters as we walk in it, so that the years of man's life measure not some small growth or rearrangement or moderation of what he has learned in childhood, but a great upheaval. What is new is that in one generation our knowledge of the natural world engulfs, upsets, and complements all knowledge of the natural world before (Oppenheimer as quoted by Bennis et al., 1976, p.1). The environment is becoming more complex and the rate of change is accelerating (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Toffler, 1983).

If change is indeed inevitable, then a better question asks how actively teacher educators should participate in change. Should they let the natural process of change occur? Will there be an automatic adjustment or active involvement? If teacher education allows change to occur naturally goals they desire may not be achieved, they may forfit the right to be masters of their own

destiny, external forces may make changes for them. If they choose not to respond to the external demands, some may not survive at all (Deal and Kennedy, 1982, Hodgkinson, 1986).

There are a variety of ways institutions of higher education may respond to change. Planned change is one "in which attempts to bring about change are conscious, deliberate, and intended, at least on the part of one or more agents related to the change attempt" (Chin and Benne, 1976, p.22). A common element of all the planned change strategies, according to Chin and Benne, is the utilization of knowledge. Planned change strategies have been criticized as being too limited in their approach to organizational change (Baldridge, 1972, Deal and Kennedy, 1982, Katz and Kahn, 1975, Sarason, 1971, Wildavsky,1979), for they ignore the conflict phenomena and external factors and do not consider problems of formal systems (Katz and Kahn, 1975). This failure to account for the complex context in which change occurs is seen as a major contributing factor to the failure of so many change efforts (Deal and Kennedy, 1982, Herriot and Gross,1979, Kent,1979, Noblit,1982, Sarason, 1971, Zaltman et al., 1977), and yet western society and higher education, in particular, seem most attached to planned change.

How individual schools and colleges of education meet the demands for reform will be, in part, a reflection not only of how they and the universities they are a part of view and understand change (Fullan,1979) but of how they view their role in the education of teachers (A Call for Change in Teacher Education, 1985). It is only when the individuals within an organization have a clear perception of the role they play in change and how change can best be accomplished that attempts at change can be maximized (Hall, 1979, Houston and PanKratz, 1981,). Because the education of teachers also occurs within colleges of Arts and Sciences the involvement of their faculty, as well as the involvement of university wide administrators, will also play a role in any change efforts.

In addition, for change to be effective it must solve the problems it is intended to solve. This entails an understanding of the problems being addressed, how the staff will react, the internal and external impediments, and how the change will effect the operation of the organization (Herriot and Gross, 1979). All of these issues need to be recognized and dealt with if the goal is substantive change rather than the illusion of change (Popkewitz, et al., 1984, Sarason, 1971). Change can be formulated, implemented and institutionalized, or it can fail at any point in the process. How organizations and individuals within organizations approach the process significantly influences the success of the attempt. Additional factors which must be in place for effective change to occur within institutions of higher education according to Wideen (1984) include, the presence of external influence, the exercising of power within the institution, the provision of shelter conditions, a formal or informal structure

to act as a capacity for change; the presence of key actors, and receptive groups both within and outside the institution.

Change in teacher education must occur in the context of the institution of which it is an element and higher education may be particularly resistive to change, particularly stable. This resistance is not purposeful but rather a result of unique characteristics which may impede significant change. These characteristics may have contributed to the observed minimal response to reform efforts of the last fifty years (Ashton and Crocker, 1987, Bush, 1987, Howsam et al., 1985). They include ambiguous goals, a high degree of professionalism, loose coupling, a problematic technology and a complex environment. They will now be discussed.

Unless change is compatible with the goals of the organization it is unlikely that it can be accomplished. This may be particularly difficult in higher education because, as Ernest Boyer indicates in College: The undergraduate experience in America, many undergraduate colleges have lost sight of their mission. If asked to define the goal of the organization university faculty often give rather nebulous responses. "They are confused about their mission and how to impart shared values on which the vitality of both higher education and society depends" (Boyer,1987,p.3). In addition, fragmentation exacerbates the problem. Higher education is fragmented by the demands of the traditional responsibilities of research, teaching and service and each may take precedence at different times. What has priority in one discipline may not have priority in another. From the nature of individual units to the perception of individual faculty members, the raison d'etre for each element of the organization remains nebulous or is in conflict with other elements. An issue then is how to reach consensus concerning goals, minimize conflict, and match institutional and change objectives.

An additional aspect of academic organizations which may constrain change is the inherent high degree of professionalism (Baldridge, 1978, Hardy et al., 1986). Academic organizations are populated by professionals. The hallmark of a "professional" is autonomy. Unless the individuals ultimately responsible for change are involved in the process change, efforts may be subverted at the individual classroom level. It may be necessary to go beyond involvement, they must be co-opted. This is complicated by the structure of colleges and universities.

Educational organizations are loosely coupled and decentralized. "Structural elements are only loosely linked to each other and to activities, rules are often violated, decisions are often unimplemented, or if, implemented have uncertain consequences, technologies are of problematic efficiency, and evaluation and inspection systems are subverted or rendered so vague as to provide little but coordination" (Meyer and Rowan,1984 p.24). In an academic organization the success of a decision to change is, in large measure, dependent on obtaining faculty input and acceptance. Without their input and acceptance, a

decision to change may well end up a decision but no change (Lindquist,1975). Loose coupling may mitigate faculty input and, thereby, their commitment to change.

Technology is defined as the methods and materials used by organizations to achieve their objectives (American Heritage Dictionary). In educational organizations the objectives deal with the education of a disparate clientele with a variety of needs, and the methods and materials used to educate that clientele make up the instructional program. Therefore, in educational organizations the instructional program is the technology (Riley and Baldridge, 1977). That technology is problematic for a variety of reasons in addition to the diverse nature of the clientele How that program is defined and the understanding of how to achieve its objectives may vary by the training, experience or philosophies of the various administrators and faculty members. The fact is, that while there is little consensus on the nature of education, education attempts to address the diverse needs of a variety of individuals. This makes the technology exceedingly problematic and may significantly impede change. If there is no clarity of purpose, is effective change possible? Fullan (1982) indicates that effective change can only occur when there is a clear, coherent sense of change. This would demand clearly articulated goals and objectives, which would, in turn, influence the selection of methods and materials for achieving them.

Institutions of higher education are surrounded by a complex environment which places increasing pressure on the institutions. An additional factor which may influence change is that degree of external influence. Some organizational theorists would argue that significant change requires significant external pressure (Katz and Kahn,1978). Because maintaining stability is the primary aim of most organizations, external pressure is necessary in order for change to be more than incremental. Institutions of higher education are viewed as being highly vulnerable to external influence and becoming increasingly so (Jonsen,1986). They must, in turn, take the complex environmental context into consideration. Such planning is the "single most important contribution to organizational decision making [because] three-quarters of all change at most institutions of higher learning is now triggered by outside factors" (Keller,1983,p.145). Change must also be supported internally as well as externally if it is to succeed. It requires organizational, administrative and individual support (Wideen and Holborn, 1986). Resources must match objectives and objectives must be clearly defined (Wildavsky,1979). All of the factors discussed contribute to the culture of higher education. If effective change is to occur they must be addressed. Change in the way universities educate teachers appears necessary and inevitable. The needs of society are changing. Schools must meet those needs. Can universities, in turn, fullfill their responsibility for educating teachers in different ways? If effective

change is to occur, they must address the elements of the context discussed above.

Conceptual frame: Defining boundries

Organizational theory provided the frame for this examination of the policy formulation process. To structure the study five levels within the organizational structure, Udy's five subsystems of organizations as identified by Baldridge (1972) and recategorized by Riley and Baldridge (1977), were used. They included the following, which will be discussed next: the goals and the decision processes used to establish them; the administrative structure or the formal power structure; the individuals, the groups and their attitudes or the informal power structure; the environmental influences; and, the technology.

Establishing goals - The decision making processes

For the purpose of this study the aspect of goals that was investigated was the process by which organizations formulate them and develop procedures for achieving them. This has been identified by organizational theorists as the process of policy formulation. Policy formulation is an aspect of organizational decision making; decision making in organizations is an aspect of governance (Katz and Kahn, 1978). A variety of frameworks can be utilized to examine the governance processes in higher education. As research on higher education has increased, images describing academic governance have also proliferated. The three models receiving widespread attention, and more or less dominating the thinking of people who study academic governance include the bureaucratic, collegial, and political models. Further, while these models continue to dominate the literature on governance, an addition to this list which is receiving increasing attention in the literature and may provide additional insight is the model identifying universities and colleges as "organized anarchies". This model is explicated by Cohen and March (1986) and the approach exemplifies the "garabage can" model of decision making (Cohen et al., 1976).

The administrative structure-the formal power structure

Institutional structure shapes and channels the processes within the organization. This can occur through the centralization of power, the development of decision councils, the long-term patterning of professional autonomy and the dynamics of departmental power (Baldridge et el., 1978). Authority resides in the formal administrative structure of the organization. It is the legitimated aspect of power, power being defined as ". . . the realistic capacity of a system-*unit* to actualize its interests within the context of system-*interaction* and in this sense exert influence on processes in the system" (Parsons in Bacharach and Lawler, 1980, p.17).

The bases of power for formal authority are coercive, remunerative, normative, and knowledge. Bases of power refer to what is being controlled to

exert influence on the system. "The coercive base of power is the control of punishment; the remunerative base is the control of rewards; the normative base is the control of symbols; and the knowledge base is the control of information" (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980, p.34). How all of those bases of power are manipulated provides a great deal of information about the culture of the organization as well as a reflection of the governance structure of that organization. Observation of the policy formulation process must include examination of the administrative structure.

Individuals, groups and their attitudes-the informal power structure

Change is dependent on the participation of the persons involved, their trust in the persons who advocate change, and clarity about the change itself (Bennis, 1975). In faculties of education Fullan, Wideen and Eastbrook (1983) found that individuals appear to be the key element in the change process. Kozma (1985) found that the involvement of individuals in policy making decisions correlated with the success of those decisions. Individuals may be involved singularly of collectively in the formulation of policy.

The individuals

If the formal adrninistrative structure represents the formal authority in an organization then the informal power is represented by the individuals within the system. Authority as a type of power comes from the structure. The power individuals have that does not rest in the formal power structure is most often identified as influence. Bacharach and Lawler(1980) identify, from a comprehensive review of the organizational literature, three sources of power that individuals can use to influence the decision making process in the organization and thereby the goals and objectives of the organization: personality, expertise, and opportunity (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980, French and Raven, 1959, Katz and Kahn, 1978, Mechanic, 1962, Weber, 1947).

Groups

Wildavsky (1979) cites Gudmond and Hernes in saying that change is mediated through individual actors but that change is an interaction between individuals and the system. If this is the case then the interaction between the individuals and the system must be a consideration. Although numerous theorists would claim that change must occur at the level of the individual participant (Hall, 1976, Argyris, 1985), history shows the human perspective model to be theoretically inadequate (Wildavsky, 1979, Katz and Kahn,1978, Baldridge,1972). "Many important decisions. . . can be made neither by individual professors nor by central administrators, but require rather the participation of various actors with different interests and expertise. Decisions in these cases emerge from complex collective and interactive processes" (Hardy et al., 1984, p.175). But "unless individuals belong to the organizational elite, it becomes difficult for them to voice their opinions politically without being vulnerable to either manipulation or outright coercion by management. . . . The only political recourse that most individuals have for their grievances is the group. The group

becomes the viable unit for political action. . . . Put simply, the group is the viable unit because, as the adage holds, there is strength in numbers" (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980, p.8).

Attitudes

Because organizational change is mediated through individuals (Wildavsky, 1979), whether singly or in groups, their attitudes must be a consideration in any investigation of policy formulation. Moreover, information about individuals' attitudes is important for additional reasons. Hardy, et al. (1984) indicate that unless attitudes of the actors is solicited when observing behavior, generalizations drawn may be very misleading; what the action appears to be, e.g., political versus collegial, may be something entirely different from the perspective of the actors. An accurate understanding of any process requires information about the attitudes of the individuals involved. A caution must be raised though; some research indicates individuals are often unable to articulate why they do what they do (Berliner, 1986), or are unaware that their behavior is in conflict with how the believe they act (Argyris and Schon, 1977, Mintzberg, 1983). The interpretation of individuals' reports of attitudes must be interpreted with this in mind.

Even aside from this potential problem, information about the attitudes of the individuals involved in the formulation of policy is important. Studies have consistently found that the involvement and commitment of the individuals and groups responsible for the implementation of policy changes is essential (Kozma,1986, Fullan, et al., 1983, Hardy et al., 1984, Lindquist, 1975). How issues are perceived will, in part, determine if substantive change occurs rather than ritualistic change. Individuals, particularly in higher education, have the ability to maintain their current mode of operation (Hardy et al. 1984). Errors must be recognized, and whether they are or not is dependant on the interest and attitudes of the individuals who participate in the policy formulation process (Wildavsky, 1979). Attitudes reflect individuals' values and values, in turn, are an aspect of the organization's culture. If they are not a major consideration in any change attempted they may be a major factor in the failure to implement and/or institutionalize the change as formulated (Deal and Kennedy, 1982, Pettigrew, 1979, Wuthnow, 1982).

Environmental Influences

"Organizational theorists are gradually realizing that many significant changes come from the environment. . . No analysis of change can afford to neglect the strong influence of the environment for both promoting, supporting, or hindering change, as the case may be" (Riley and Baldridge , 1977 , p.89). Some organizational theorists contend that organizations are especially vulnerable to external pressure (Katz and Kahn 1978, Baldridge and Deal, 1978) and that higher education is becoming increasingly so (Jonsen, 1986, Peterson, 1985). Therefore, the relationship between the organization and its environment must be considered in any investigation of policy formulation.

For the purposes of this study, "the term environment [was] reserved for impinging or potentially impinging factors outside the organization" (Katz and Kahn, 1978, p.136). Jonsen's (1986) classification of the elements in the environment of higher education provided further clarification. He identifies the demographic, economic, political, organizational, technological and the social environments. Which of these environmental pressures, if any, will universities respond to? What form will the response take? Will organizations attempt to neutralize the pressure? Will they respond symptomatically? Will they respond in substantive ways or will they respond by redefining the problems faced? (Wildavsky, 1979)

Technology

The technology, as a subsystem of educational organizations, is important because "the structure of the educational system is shaped at least partly shaped by its technology . . . When instructional change occurs, changes must also be made in the structure of the organization, or the program will not function well" (Riley and Baldridge,1977,p.89). Technology is defined as the methods and materials organizations use to achieve their objectives.

The technology of educational organizations reflects one of the primary missions of higher education, the creation and dissemination of valid knowledge (Weick, 1984, Boyer,1987, Bok,1986). The mission to create and disseminate valid knowledge may lie at the heart of the uniqueness of institutions of higher education as organizations. That mission contributes to a structure of high differentiation and low integration. "This structure occurs because cross-departmental linkage is done on an individual basis, feedback is unreliable, decisions do not require consensus, and research technology constrains departmental forms (Weick, 1984, p.16). This structure, in turn, supports the idiosyncratic nature of the technology.

Individuals operate within commonly defined norms of "academic freedom". What they do within their classrooms is their business. (Wildavsky, 1979). How they choose to address the responsibilities of teaching is, in large measure, an individual decision. Academics come to positions with "terminal degrees", implying expertise which includes a set of skills and techniques founded on a base of knowledge. They are professionals and with professionalism comes the autonomy of choice. They may choose to participate in the organization or they may choose not to, and the choice they make will do more to determine the fate of any given policy than perhaps any other decision made. Policy may be formulated but incorporation of that policy within the instructional program (technology) requires participation of the individuals within the institution.

A change in technology will have an impact on the organization (Riley and Baldridge, 1978). In addition, the organization will have an impact on any attempt to change the instructional program. Changing the instructional

program may require that individuals spend their time differently, carry out different work, ask different questions and form new relationships. It may require a change in the rituals and symbols of the organization, it may require what Deal and Kennedy (1982) refer to as a cultural transformation. Any study of policy formulation must consider the interaction between a change effort and the technology. This is particularly critical to this discussion. The recommendations in the majority of reform reports deal directly with the instructional program in teacher education and require significant changes in the technology and the culture of the organization. Organizations are complex and that complexity must be a consideration in any examination of their operations. The interaction of the subsystems within the organization will drive a change effort and, in large measure, determine its success or failure.

Methods

The methods utilized in this study encompassed the aspects of the organization that have been identified above: the decison making processes; the formal authority structure; the informal authority structure, i.e., the groups, individuals and their attitudes; the technology; and the external environment. In addition, the unique characteristics of institutions of higher education and their effect on policy have also been incorporated. A case study approach was used because it is the most appropriate method for investigating a "contemporary phenomenon within its real life context; when - the boundries between the phenomenon and the context, are not clearly evident; and in which - multiple sources of evidence are used"(Yin, 1984, p. 23).

Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis was a public comprehensive university that began as a normal school. This selection was made for three reasons, (1) the majority of undergraduate degrees are granted by comprehensive public universities (Stern and Williams, 1986), (2) many teacher training programs began in normal schools which have evolved into comprehensive universities. Many of these institutions still consider teacher training to be an aspect of their mission and therefore may be more responsive to mandated change; (3) results of this study may have relevance for a larger number of institutions than it would if a private institution or an institution which does not consider teacher education as a major aspect of its mission was selected. One of the constituent institutions in a university system, identified in this study as the University of the Southeast, which meets these requirements was selected as the unit of analysis. It will be identified as PCTE University for the purposes of this discussion. Three levels within the organization were encompassed, the General Adminstration of the system, the university wide administration at PCTE, and the level of the deans at PCTE in the structure of a steering committee established to oversee the implementation of the mandates.

Policy focus

Many states are addressing reform in teacher education in response to the numerous reform reports. The Board of Governors of the University of the Southeast established, through legislative action, a task force on the preparation of teachers in response to the growing concerns about the condition of public schools and the education students were receiving. After thirteen months of study and testimony from educational authorities both outside and within the state the task force made thirty-nine specific recommendations regarding the preparation of teachers. Of these thirty-nine recommendations, seventeen are the responsibility of institutions of higher education. How PCTE University formulated policy in response to these recommendations was the focus of this study.

Sources of evidence

Multiple sources of evidence were collected and included documentation, interviews, and observation. To interpret and analyze the sources of evidence three types of notes were utilized: substantive fieldnotes, methodological notes, and analytic notes (Burgess, 1984). Substantive fieldnotes are a continuous record of observations, interviews, and documentation collected. The substantive fieldnotes are the basis of the "thick descriptions". Methodological notes are the researcher's reflections on occurances in the process of the study. Methodological notes include reference to any issues or concerns regarding the validity and reliability of the data collected and the procedures utilized. Analytic notes begin the analysis process. The coding scheme developed from the review of literature provided the structure for the analytic notes. As the data were coded preliminary questions posed were addressed. Propositions were developed from the analytic notes and were further tested by the additional collection of data. As Van Maanen(1983) points out, " the key analytic decisions of qualitative study are most often accomplished by the investigator in the research setting itself and . . . the selection of substantive topics to pursue in a given study cannot be disembodied from the actual research process itself" (p. 14).

Documentation.

Documentation included the following: letters, memoranda, and other communiques; agendas, announcements and minutes of meetings, and other written reports of events; administrative documents - proposals, progress reports, and other internal documents. Documents were used to corroborate evidence from other sources (Yin, 1983). Documentation dealing with the task force recommendations was reviewed and/or collected from the office of the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the General Administration, the steering committee and the offices of the dean of education and the dean of arts and

sciences. Documentation reflects the involvement and support of the formal authority structure in change. In addition, it provides information about a key lever for change, the interplay between organizational subsystems (Baldridge, 1972).

Interviews

Interviews were a second source of evidence collected in building the case study. Interviews were used to obtain information regarding the subject of study from the individuals involved. The individuals interviewed were from three levels in the organization; the General Adminstration, university-wide adminstrators, and the deans. Twelve different individuals were formally interviewed between April of1987 and December of 1987. The number of times they were interviewed ranged from once to seven times for a total of 36 formal interviews.

Interviews were open-ended but "focused" by the policy focus of the study as well as the study's conceptual frame. Respondents were asked about the "facts" as well as their opinions. Change is mediated through individual actors therefore the perceptions of the various actors was especially crucial to this study of organizational change. Interviews were ongoing and their schedule determined by the process as it occurred. To assure that the information obtained was relevant, as interviews proceeded questions were developed from the data obtained during and between the interviews as well as the literature used to corroborate the developing issues. Each interview was audio-taped, transcribed and coded utilizing coding categories developed from the theoretical frames supporting the study.

Observation

Because individuals' reports of behavior are frequently different from their actual behavior, observation is an important source of evidence which provides the researcher with the opportunity to verify information obtained in interviews (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984). Van Maanen (1983) draws a further distinction between what is observed by differentiating presentational and operational data. The operational data is what is actually observed in the day to day activities observed and engaged in by the researcher. "These data surface in known and describable contexts and pertain to the everyday problematics of informants going about their affairs" (p.42). In contrast, presentational data relates to those "appearances that informants strive to maintain (or enhance) in the eyes of the fieldworker, outsiders and strangers in general, work colleagues, close and intimate associates, and to varying degrees, themselves" (p.42). Researchers must continually cross validate observations and interviews, behavior and action.

In this study the researcher was both an observer and participant-observer. As a faculty member of PCTE University and the School of Education her role was that of participant-observer. To maintain objectivity in the collection of data she assumed no more active a role in the policy formulation

process than any of the other faculty members in the School of Education. Being a member of the faculty allowed the opportunity to observe the degree of involvement in the process provided for members of the faculty and provided the opportunity to observe how the recommendations were handled on an on-going basis within the university itself. In addition, faculty membership provided an understanding not available to individuals outside the organization.

A major component of data collection was the observation of steering committee meetings. This was the most direct of the observations conducted because the researcher did not participate in any way. Verbatim notes of these meetings were the substantive notes for these observations. Methodological notes were also maintained. Analytic notes were developed by coding the methodological and substantive notes utilizing the developing coding scheme. Analytic notes provided information corroborated through interviews, review of documentation and additional observation.

Documentation, systematic interviews and observation provided multiple sources of data that were used to cross-validate inferences and conclusions. Because analysis was on-going, ample opportunity was provided to follow up on conflicting or non-corroborated data. Yin (1984) cites three principles of data collection that were followed in the course of this study. They included, using multiple sources of evidence, creating a case study data base, and maintaining a chain of evidence.

Findings

Three levels within the organizational structure were encompassed in this examination of the policy formulation process in higher education: the level of the General Administration, the university-wide adminstration at PCTE, and the level of deans. In the course of study other levels of the organization were only minimally involved. This study also sought to determine how the subsystems of the organization interacted in the formulation process and how the organizational characteristics of higher education influenced the process. The findings will now be discussed. At PCTE the recommendations that have been dealt with included only the following:

1. That all undergraduate teacher education students in early childhood education, elementary education, middle grades education, special education, and all other education degree programs also complete a second major in one of the basic academic disciplines or an interdisciplinary major.

2. That all specially designed undergraduate courses in the basic fields of study offered only for education majors be eliminated.

3. That there be cooperative development of one- and two-year clinical teaching programs in the public schools, such programs to be limited to colleges and school systems with adequate resources and commitments for conducting effective teacher education programs.

4. That the capacity of colleges and universities to implement the Quality Assurance Program be strengthened by the provision of new resources to provide additional administrative personnel and support resources required to meet new standards for certification and reporting requirements. Such action would help assure more effective administrative operations in Schools and Departments of Education resulting in more effective use of instructional faculty.

5. That a Distinguished Scholars Fund be established to bring outstanding visiting scholars to education faculties and that resources be provided to attract promising young education faculty members to institutions in the state.

Although the steering committee modified and adopted a set of management plans developed in the School of Education to guide the implementation of the recommendations, they have not followed them in relation to the above recommendations. Their rational approach was diverted by the bureaucracy. Funding for the third and fifth recommendations above was presented in the form of two requests for proposals from the General Administration on November 6, 1987, with a four to five week turnaround period. The response was handled by the co-chairs of the steering committee through assignment of personnel to committees to address the proposals. The School of Education assumed the responsibility for writing and submitting the proposals. The management plans were followed to some extent but only to the degree feasible given the time factor. The fact that some of the recommendations would result in RFP's had been communicated to the individuals involved but they had not developed any plans to deal with RFP's nor did they address future RFP's in any discussions.

A significant proportion of three meetings of the steering committee was involved in the discussion of the management plan to deal with the fourth recommendation. When it was funded the money was assigned directly to the School of Education and a job description was developed by individuals within the school with no input from the steering committee. The position has not yet been advertised. The money has been allocated, and the Dean has opted to use the money to fund other positions temporarily and to complete the search this spring. Decisions regarding this recommendation were solely under the control of the Dean of the School of Education. The General Administration indicated that it has taken two years to get positions funded that are administrative, carry no teaching responsibilities and go directly to the School of Education

(Interview, no. 46). Negotiation and bargaining played a role in the creation of these positions at the level of the General Administration, but at each of the other levels the position has been handled bureaucratically, the decision was made from the top down. On September 28,1987, a memo was received from the Vice President for finance of the University system to finance officers on each campus indicating the inclusion of the position and what it would be identified as and utilized for, "the institutional budget allocations for 1987-1988 included a position, or portion of position, of Program Officer to provide additional administrative support to meet the new standards for teacher certification and reporting requirements" (Memo, 9/28/87). Rather than decisions being made by "flight or oversight" these were made as "best as they could be under the circumstances". The first recommendation has been the primary focus of the work of the steering committee since its inception in February of 1987 and most of the interaction between the levels within the organization have dealt with this recommendation. The process of how policy was formulated will now be discussed.

The policy formulation process

The general administration

Each level within the organization has addressed the process in different ways. At the level of the General Administration the process has been comprehensive and multidimensional. While appearing to be primarily rational, utilizing knowledge to make decisions, the political, personal and symbolic aspects of change have not been ignored. Special meetings called with Arts and Science Deans and Education Deans was a way to address threats resulting from the changes being required (Interview no. 1, p. 35). From the beginning, the importance of both the CAO and Dean of Arts and Sciences in any change effort has been recognized as indicated in a memo from the General Administration , ". . . please be sure to coordinate with your Chief Academic Officer and Dean of Arts and Sciences. It is important at the outset that the report be viewed as a campus-wide matter requiring full cooperation among all units for implementation" (1/9/1987). This approach addresses the political aspects of the process, i.e., the utilization of influence. The personal side of the threat of change was also dealt with by the one to one contact made by personnel at the level of the General Administration with individuals on individual campuses. Frequent phone calls, formal and informal meetings and planned presentations were designed as one way to help stem the anxiety resulting from change (Interview no. 30, p. 15). The symbolic approach to change is apparent in the way the General Administration is dealing with the constituent institutions. The major emphasis on the reform of the preparation of teachers is symbolic of the significance of the effort and draws attention to each university's responsibility. It legitimizes the education of teachers system-wide.

Decisions regarding the second major have a "give and take" appearance, but to this point in time have been made bureaucratically, from the top down,

very rationally. Individual institutions were asked, in January of 1987, to review specific degree programs in their insititutions and to identify both those they recommended to be accepted as a "second major" in a "basic academic discipline" and those they felt were exemptions to the second major requirement. The General Administration identified the eligible second majors as well as those undergraduate programs that were subject to the second major. Individual units were requested to submit supporting documentation for any modifications to the designated programs. By November of 1987 neither decisions regarding acceptable majors nor the programs requiring a second major had been made although three categories of programs requiring a second major had been delineated, by the General Administration. From the original list they identified the following: those that would definitely require a second major such as elementary education and special education; programs at individual institutions that would be reviewed by a panel to determine if they would require a second major, at PCTE that was the science education program, and; a third category of programs that were considered more problematic such as health and physical education and business education. Two decisions need to be made regarding the third category of programs, first whether they would require a second major, and second, whether they could be used as second majors (Interview No. 36, p.17). The original purpose of the second major was to provide education students with ". . . a coherent academic experience in addition to professional education. [To] . . . provide in depth study in a basic discipline [that] will help assure people who go into teaching have had a disciplinary experience. They will become better learners - their learning to learn experience will be richer" (Interview No. 9, p.4). The General Administration is holding to this goal (Interview no. 36, p.22).

University-wide administration.

The university-wide administration at PCTE has been in transition throughout the process. Both the Chancellor and the Chief Academic Officer have changed since the Task Force report was adopted by the Board of Governors. Currently an acting Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs is in place. Initially the university wide administration, through the office of the Vice-Chancellor, allocated decision making power to a steering committee composed of the five deans whose programs house undergraduate teacher certification programs, i.e., Art, Arts and Sciences, Education, Music and Technology. Their responsibilities were indicated in a memo to Deans and Directors on February 25, " I am establishing the Steering Committee for the Board of Governors' mandates, and charging the Committee to oversee the implementation of the mandates, to involve other groups as feasible in the planning and implementation of the mandates, and to insure that PCTE does move ahead as expeditiously as possible to put these mandates into operation" (Internal memo, 2/25/87). In regard to the second major in particular, they were assigned the responsibility "for taking on the bulk of the work in preparing the report requested by the General

Adminstration in their memo of January 26" (Internal memo. February, 1987). Although interest groups sought the support of the administration to override decisions made by the steering committee regarding second majors, the original decisions of the steering committee were upheld. Decision making has been bureaucratic at the level above the steering committee. The "loose coupling" characteristic of higher education was apparent in the transition of vice-chancellors. Although the General Administration views the CAO's as crucial to the strenghthening of teacher education, " . . . the CAO's are crucial, they are at the top of the pyrimid. They have to get everyone working together" (Interview no. 10, p. 7), the acting Vice-Chancellor was given minimal information regarding the mandates from the previous Vice-Chancellor, and was not formally involved in discussions until the GA meeting of CAO's five months after he assumed office (Interview no. 17, p.7 no.27, p.22). The pattern for how the university wide administration would deal with the Task Force report was set by the first Vice-Chancellor in place; he assigned all responsibility to the steering committee. This may be changing. The current Vice-Chancellor may assume a more active role in the process. The steering committee appointed a coordinator to facilitate the work of the committees identified in the management plans; the Vice-Chancellor has assigned that individual to his office.

The primary approach to change from this level has been bureaucratic or structural. The Vice-Chancellor created a structure, the steering committee, to deal with the mandates. This was a top-down decision. The selection of the co-chairs, the dean of Arts and Sciences and the dean of Education appears political but supports the General Adminstration's perspective and may therefore be best interpreted as both political and bureaucratic. The effort has been legitimated on campus in ways that could be viewed as symbolic. In January of 87 the Chancellor requested that the Teacher Education Faculty, the Chairs and Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences and Deans and Directors attend ". . . a special meeting to hear a report of the Board of Governors' Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers" (Internal memo, 1/7/87). But rather than the university-wide administration dealing with the process with regard to the culture this effort can be traced back to the General Administration (Interview, no. 1, p. 12). The university-wide administration has only involved individuals in the formal authority structure in the policy formulation process. The involvement of others has been left up to the steering committee. "I am establishing the Steering Committee for the Board of Governors' mandates, and charging the Committee to oversee the implementation of the mandates, *to involve other groups as feasible* in the planning and implementation of the mandates, and to insure that PCTE does move ahead as expeditiously as possible to put these mandates into operation" (Internal memo, 2/25/87). The university wide administration has taken a neutral stance to this point.

Deans - the steering committee

The deans on the steering committee were allocated the decision making power and responsibility for policy formulation by the university wide administration. The co-chairs are the greatest stake-holders and have been the most active in all negotiations (Steering committee notes), their programs being the ones most directly affected although each of the others had a stake in the second major recommendation. The steering committee was assigned the responsibility for compiling the reports requested by the General Administration. Individual units and departments were requested to submit information to them regarding their programs, but the five deans on the steering committee had the final responsibility for designating which programs outside of the GA's list would be recommended as second majors as well as indicating those education programs they felt did not require a second major. From the first meeting of the steering committee on February 9, until the sixth meeting on March 20th, the steering committee heard presentations and received position papers from various programs justifying their programs as a second major or as an exception to the requirement for a second major. The process appeared very rational (i.e., collect sufficient information and make decisions based on the information), but the way they voted would indicate it was much more political (e.g., all exceptions finally submitted to the GA were programs overseen by the deans on the steering committee). As indicated by one of the deans on the steering committee when he stated that they "engineered" change when they took a rational approach to defining the second major question rather than provoking change by looking at more creative ways of dealing with the issue (Interview No. 19, p.13).

The policy formulation process at the level of the deans did not include any elements of the symbolic or cultural frame, nor did they seem particularly involved in the human resources approach. The influence of the General Administration's mutidimensional approach to change seems to stop at the level of university-wide administration. "Turf" becomes much more of an issue at the level of the deans, and the characteristics of higher education as organizations affect the formulation process at this level more than it does at other levels. Of the five propositions summarizing the political perspective (Bolman and Deal, 1984) the one that most clearly represents the work of the steering committee is the following, "individuals and interest groups differ in their values, preferences, beliefs, information, and perceptions of reality. Such differences are usually enduring and change slowly if at all" (p. 109).

Interaction of the subsystems

The dominant subsystems in the process were the decision-making processes, the formal power structure and actors from that formal structure. The interaction between those subsystems and the policy formulation process was most apparent in how different individuals used the system to achieve their goals. Individuals operated out of different frames (Bolman and Deal, 1984). Some took an eclectic approach, utilizing more than one frame. Others

worked the system very politically, using their formal authority in conjunction with influence to accomplish their goals. Some of the deans addressed issues outside of their formal authority and attempted to garner support for their positions. "My week this past week has been [spent] talking privately with . . . chairs [of other programs]. They get very programatic about FTE's" (Interview No. 29, p.8). Some also worked within their formal authority but outside of the steering committee, "I got [them] in a room and gave them the NCATE and SDPI guidelines, the mandates and the Carnegie and Holmes reports and they developed a beautiful course. . . . We already have it through the faculty senate. If I had gone through the steering committee we never would have gotten it. The pitiful thing about how I got that course through was that there was no discussion except by a very few" (Interview No. 32, p. 4). And some were "organization" men and used their formal roles within the system to accomplish their goals. All, to this point in the process, used their frame more to maintain the status quo than to facilitate change. No substantive change in the education of teachers has occurred. Rather than being an "organized anarchy" higher education may be a culturally diverse organization with individuals operating not only within the boundries of the culture of their discipline, their unit and their institution (Dill, 1982), but also within a personal organizational frame. What further complicates any process is that the individuals within the organization all think they speak the same language when, in fact, they have different realities (Bolman and Deal, 1984). This gives the appearance of an "organized anarchy" to a confederation of units viewing the organization of which they are each an element through incompatible lenses.

The involvement and investment of individual faculty members at PCTE University has not been sought, although some were more active in getting their interest articulated than others and went directly to the higher administration: "It is my understanding from colleagues at two other [University of the Southeast] universities that they have presented their position on this issue and the respective steering committees have taken steps to include this exception. I have also been told by one of [PCTE] University's committee members that our committee is taking the most restricted route toward the mandate of any of the [University of the Southeast] campuses. I find the committee's decision profoundly regrettable" (Internal memo, March 26, 1987), but the decisions of the steering committee were upheld. Influence through interest articulation did not work, the informal power structure does not seem to be operating, on this issue, as much as Baldridge's (1971) findings would indicate.

The professional autonomy of individual faculty members can either constrain or facilitate any change effort depending on how it is recognized. Whatever decisions are made by the administration must be implemented by the faculty. Steering committee minutes are distributed to all faculty members but are not an apparent topic of conversation in the school of education. Neither groups nor individuals seem aware of, or concerned with the progress of the

steering committee regarding the second major, or any other recommendation. The environment does not seem to support or encourage discussion. As one of the deans indicated, "we have a major reform underway and there is a paucity of discussion on that and I am probably at fault in not creating an environment in which that can occur" (Interview No.18, p.10).

PCTE does have plans to involve a wider audience in the formulation of implementation plans for other recommendations. The infuence of that wider audience on the change effort is yet to be determined. The steering committee maintains the final decision making authority in all matters and, thereby, power over any change effort. What is significant about how the change has been managed to this point is the involvement of diverse constituencies such as the school of education and the college of arts and sciences, and, as Carver and Krajewski (1983) indicate, "within institutions of higher education, the coalescing of divergent interest groups around powerful ideas, which is difficult, is where the action is" (p.24). They are actively working together for the first time (Interview No. 7, p.14) and this has been orchestrated by the General Administration. Whether they are able to coalesce around the issue is yet to be determined. This may require the support of university wide administrators.

The external environment has had an influence on the process. The most apparent has been accreditation. Reference was frequently made to accreditation requirements when alternatives were discussed. This could be interpreted as the utilization of expertise as a source of influence over and above formal authority. Accreditation as a frequent referent can also be attributed to the fact that one of the other recommendations requires national accreditation, by 1990, for all institutions within the state that educate teachers. The accreditation issue can also be interpreted as ". . . issues and feelings looking for decision situations in which they might be aired" (Cohen et al., 1976, p.1). PCTE's School of Education lost its accreditation in1982 and the solution to that situation resulted in organizational restructuring that continues to be an issue. This issue has been addressed directly by the steering committee as well as being an issue to the deans interviewed. (Interview No. 16, p.33). Policy history can have a significant impact on future policy (Sarason, 1971). Regardless of the underlying rationale, it was apparent that accrediting agencies exert a significant influence on program decisions. Goals become redefined through external influence. Additional external influence was manifested through the state board of education's decision not to adopt a second major as a requirement for certification (Interview No. 12, p.15). This has been an issue, and cited as a reason why the steering committee has not proceeded more expeditiously in defining what the second major would entail at PCTE University. They do not want to proceed and have the second major overturned at a later time. (CTE meeting, December 14, 1987). In addition, professional organizations have written position papers expressing concerns with the

requirement for a second major. The second major is being looked on as ". . .a quantitative matter, how do you add thirty-six hours?, or as a punitive matter - people in education are so bad they have to do it twice" (Interview No. 12, p.18).

Individuals on the steering committee attribute the impetus for the recommended second major to a variety of factors: " You would have to ask people in the school of education but what I sense is there is a real question about the quality of teachers in elementary and secondary systems. The reason that is being asked is because the level of students in basic skills is not satisfactory in terms of colleges reporting the quality of students they are getting. I don't think we should confuse skills with education. That is the impetus behind [the first recommendation] - how well educated are the teachers of our children?" (Interview No. 13, p.2); "I think there is something afoot in the country today that says something needs to be done with teacher education. . . the Board of Governors has the weight of the entire nation, if you will, behind the weight of this decision to conduct the study and then write the mandates the way they did" (Interview No. 2, p.16). Other factors considered relevant to how the steering committee addressed the second major question included the institution's clientele and their perceived satisfaction with the education currently provided (19th meeting of the steering committee). There is the perception of significant external pressure for change while at the same time there appears to be significant internal pressure for maintaining the status quo.

Cohen and March (1986) indicate that although the discussion of programs (technology) is influenced by the necessity of organizational life, it is usually couched in terms of the educational needs of students. This seldom occurred in the discussions of the second major. The issue was dealt with quantitatively rather than substantively. Although several of the recommendations deal with the educational program of pre-service teachers, the relationship between the academic component and the professional component has not been addressed directly. The problematic nature of the technology, as indicated by Baldridge and Deal (1973), was very apparent in the discussions about the second major. Individuals had different perceptions of the underlying purpose as indicated by one dean: "It is really not clear to me. It is clear to them but not to me. I actually disagree with the committee's recommendation [regarding physical education]. To me it didn't meet the need of a basic academic discipline; therefore, it should need a second major. They were saying it was a basic discipline not requiring any other discipline, and my understanding of a discipline isn't that" (Interview No. 21, p.5).

The technology is also problematic due to the institution's role in the organizational environment and the diverse clientele it serves. In part, "because [PCTE is] a comprehensive school and more professionally oriented, we don't look at the definition of an academic major in the same sense. We prepare people for careers. That is different than just giving them an education or a liberal arts education" (Interview No. 6, p.7).

The differences between professional schools and the rest of the university was also seen as an issue that confounded the definition of a second major. "When I talked about . . . a coherent course of study [many faculty in schools of education] didn't know what I was talking about. They didn't understand what a basic academic discipline was and wasn't. Many wouldn't have been able to explain the difference between biology and engineering. Many people teaching in college are themselves products of a limited education in that sense "(Interview No. 30, p.23). Not having a shared understanding, they generally followed the recommendations of the General Administration. "By and large I think on a pragmatic level the committee has accepted the definition provided by the General Administration's Vice President for Academic Affairs" (Interview No. 5, p.2).

Most members indicated they felt broader issues would never be discussed because the issues were too sensitive, ". . . you are cicumscribed by the nature of the committee and its charge. . . people would have to defend themselves over and over and over again and then you are defending the whole nature of your program. That is a tough thing to accept" (Interview No. 16, p.17). The technology is problematic for many reasons and ultimately the delivery of programs tends to be influenced by the necessity of organizational life in the university (Cohen and March, 1986). This was apparent at PCTE University.

The influence of characteristics of higher education

"We talk about reforming teacher education but we want them to be educated first, but that hasn't been defined by the university. . . What is a general education? Until the university answers that question it is going to be difficult for us" (Interview, No. 5 p.5). Who is responsible for defining the goals and objectives of reform? The goals of the task force are explicit in the report, and do not appear overly ambiguous. They become ambiguous when individual institutions attempt to define them in order to implement them. Different disciplines define rigor in different ways. The differences between the liberal arts approach to education and the carreer approach to education confounds any clarification of common goals. Rather than attempting to restructure the education of preservice teachers to strengthen it by making it more rigorous so that teachers are as well educated as they are professionally trained, they attempt to fit the recommendations into the existing structure. At this point it is impossible to determine if they are attempting illusory or technical implementation (Popkewitz et al., 1982). Are they perceiving the recommendations as ambiguous to justify maintenance of the status quo or to increase the effectiveness of current programs? Unless goals are addressed directly and uniformly, it is unlikely they will be actively working towards goals different from those now in place, or towards constructive implementation.

Loose coupling contributed to an initial failure to invest the current university-wide administration in the effort. Since the initiation of the

steering committee PCTE University has had both a change in its chief academic o' er and its chancellor. The General Adminstration initially made a cc certed attempt to involve the CAO's in this effort including the first CAO in place at PCTE (Interview No. 1, p. 22). The current CAO had no direct contact with General Administration in regard to the reform effort until the meeting of the CAO's five months after he took office and the previous CAO gave him minimal information regarding the effort (Interiview No. 14, p.27). A personal interest on his part made him more cognizant of the reform but it has not been seen as a personal priority at this point by any office above the level of the deans.

The high degree of professionalism in higher education certainly contributes to this set of circumstances. As someone in the General Adminstration indicated, universities are structured to allow the faculty to do their jobs. What the General Administration chooses to do it to let each institution decide on its own how to deal with implementation while they oversee that implementation in a broad sense (Interview 30, p.40). Decision making is decentralized to a great extent; this may be a natural response in an organization in which hierarchy of authority is not functional (Wideen, 1984). The problematic technology and the external environment influenced the process as indicated above. No one has stepped forth to champion the change effort. The fact that no one has may be indicative of the desire on the part of the actors involved for illusory implementation.

Implications

Bolman and Deal (1983) indicate that the dismal record of organizational reform is attributable, in part, to the inablility of management to view organizations through a variety of frames and therby to think flexibly and produce elastic strategies (p. 300). It is these elastic strategies that, according to Bolman and Deal, encourage the give and take that keeps organizations evolving and changing. This belief echoes Wildavsky's (1979) contention that successful policy requires speaking truth to power, an interaction between rational planning and politics. If we view change through these perspectives what implications can be drawn from this study regarding the potential for substantive change in the way teachers are educated at PCTE?

The structural frame

The structural frame most closely parallels the subsystem identified as the administrative structure. It provides the view of the organization as a bureaucracy and depends, in large measure, on formal authority to accomplish its goals. The structure of the organization, from this perspective, reflects its goals, technology, environment and participants. Utilizing a structural frame the lack of progress of the steering committee can be attributed to a structural pathology identified by Bolman and Deal (1984) as *diffuse authority* , ". . . no one knows, or everyone disagrees about, who is in charge of an important activity.

The confusion often limits initiative and creates conflict" (p. 52). Although the steering committee was a structure instituted to make decisions regarding the task force recommendation it seemed to be waiting for the General Administration to make decisions for them. At a meeting of the governing body for teacher education of PCTE in December, when the mandates and progress of the steering committee were first discussed, this was apparent in the discussions that occurred. The frequent references to the reorganization of teacher education in 1982 and the time spent by the steering committee trying to resolve old issues resulting from this highlight the diffusion of authority. Decisions regarding teacher education at PCTE are being made jointly by five deans with the Dean of Education having no more authority than the others. This reflects the regard with which teacher education is held in the institution and the lack of control it has over its own programs (Lanier and Little, 1986). The structure designed to make decisions is unable to do so because of diffuse authority based, among other things, on past policy history. This problem can be addressed by organizational restructuring, by providing a structure that allows education to be responsible for and accountable for its programs. This restructuring would also allow education to address the changes in the environment, technology and political climate reflected in the reform reports and the task force recommendations.

The political frame

The political frame suggests that change occurs when ". . . a particular individual or group is able to impose its agenda on the organization. . . significant change occurs only when there are significant shifts in the balance of power" (Bolman and Deal, 1984, p.132). Leadership, above formal authority, was cited as a need by many of those interviewed (Interviews, no. 9, 17, 19, 30) and yet it is not apparent at either the level of the university wide administration or the steering committee. As Wildavsky points out, policy is mediated through individuals but no one seems to have the clear coherent sense of change cited by Fullan (1983) to mediate the change with the exception of individuals at the level of the General Administration. They express a consistency in the goals and objectives of the task force recommendations not apparent at other levels (Interviews no. 1, 9, 12, 30, 36). They have communicated these goals and continue to do so. Although the acting Vice-Chancellor has an understanding that mirrors the General Administration's, he has not chosen to take a more active role and supports this as the responsibility of the Dean of the School of Education.

The steering committee continues to wait for decisions that will not be forthcoming from the General Administration in any direct fashion. There does not appear to be a commitment to change at the level of the steering committee, their behavior is at variance with their expression. Change may be no more than an illusion without leadership and commitment. As Keller (1988) indicates, "I've come to see that academic strategies need idea champions. . . . [This need]

lies behind any strategic venture on campus. Whether a college is going coed, dropping football, or creating an effective school of education, there has to be one or more persons who will personally crusade with that idea, who will stake their careers on it" (p. 4). But individuals also need to be allowed to champion their ideas and an environment in which their perspective is heard and respected. Attitudes towards teacher education make this difficult at best (Lanier and Little, 1986, Popkewitz, 1987, Wisniewski, 1984).

Human resources frame

The human resources frame is built on the assumption, among others, that there should be a fit between the organization and the individuals within the organization. Individual needs must be met in order for those individuals to meet the needs of the organization (Bolman and Deal, 1984). An element of many of the reform reports has been the "professionalization" of the teaching profession as a way of meeting the needs of teachers and, in turn, a way to benefit the educational enterprise. The "professionalization" of teacher educators has not been addressed, but attitudes in institutions of higher education towards teacher education would indicate that the professional status of faculty in schools and colleges of education is an issue. Professional satisfaction results when individuals ". . . experience a sense of achievement, recognition for performance, satisfactions intrinsic to the work, responsibility, advancement, and learning" (Bolman and Deal, 1984, p. 84). Dissatisfaction occurs as a result of policy and administration, supervision and working conditions. Teacher education occurs in organizations which often devalue, through a variety of ways, the work done in schools and colleges of education. At times this devaluation emerges as hostility (Lanier and Little, 1986). One of the ways these attitudes are communicated to teacher educators is by denying them opportunities to manage their own work.

The management of the task force recommendations at PCTE supports this perspective. The Dean of the School of Education has not been given the authority or power over his own programs in regard to the recommendations. He has been asked to share that power with four other deans. "University faculty and their administrators remain just close enough to teacher education to avoid entrusting it to the 'teacher educators," yet they remain sufficiently distant to avoid being identified with the enterprise" (p. 530). Actions of the steering committee have also limited the involvement of other individuals within the school of education. Although they will utimately be responsible for the implementation of the recommendations, they have not been afforded the opportunity to engage in active discussions regarding what this will mean for their programs. Their input has not been sought in any collective fashion and only minimally on an individual basis. This may be attributed to their "[l]ow status (which) keeps the power to organize change out of the hands of those closest to the field"(Lanier & Little, 1986, p.565). The involvement and commitment of the individuals and groups responsible for the implementation of

policy changes is essential (Kozma, 1986, Fullan et al., 1983, Hardy et al., 1984) but teacher educators have not been given that opportunity at PCTE.

Symbolic frame

The structural, political and human resources frames parrallel models of planned change in that they are based on the belief that the world of organizations operates in some rational fashion. If provided with sufficient knowledge individuals will make decisions by selecting the most effective alternative. The symbolic frame, in contrast sees organization in constant flux. Because most individuals need stability "[w]hen faced with uncertainty and ambiguity, humans create symbols to reduce the ambiguity, resolve confusion, increase predictability, and provide direction. Events themselves may remain illogical, random, fluid, and meaningless, but human symbols make them seem otherwise" (Bolman and Deal, 1984, p.150). When the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs formed a steering committee to oversee the implementation of the mandates he was conducting a ritual to deal with a complex, and perhaps unresolvable issue, the reform of teacher education. That committee has been going through the ceremony of implementing change while in actuality very little has changed over the ten months it has been in operation.

The myth of the non-productivity of faculties of schools of education (Wisniewski, 1984) and the myth of a limited knowledge base (Berliner, 1985) legitimates attitudes towards teacher educators that do not allow them to be treated in an equitable manner in the institutions of which they are a part. The attitude that teacher education is not capable of mastering its own destiny is reflected in the composition of the structure created to plan implementation. Although the Council for Teacher Education, the governing body for teacher education at PCTE has representatives from each unit on campus that prepares school based personnel, it was bypassed by the administration in favor of a new structure which has clearly limited education's control. The organization has symbolically reified existing attitudes and myths about teacher education. It has very clearly indicated to the broader academic community that education needs help. This is not meant to deny that education must assume some responsibility for how it is perceived. But education cannot be accountable for its own actions if it has little control over them. Structure, politics, individuals and symbols will determine if it is allowed this control and only then can it be held accountable.

Conclusions

Will PCTE University be able to respond in an effective way to demands for change in the way they educate teachers? If clearly articulated goals, open communication between interest groups, an understanding of the interaction between the change effort and the technology, a recognition of the human costs, active involvement of the individuals ultimately responsible for the change, consideration of the complex environmental context, a clear perception of the

need for change on the part of the participants and an idea champion are necessary conditions for constructive change rather than the illusion of change, then the potential for effective change in the way that PCTE University educates teachers seems unlikely. But change is a process and not an event, and many conditions currently in place suggest that substantive change is still a possibility. There is external influence present, a formal structure for change, the presence of key actors, receptive groups both within and outside of the institution, financial support and proposed change which is relevant to the history of the organization. Change is complex and organizations are complex, and change above all else, is a process. To understand the process of change in organizations requires an examination of the process over the full extent of the process. This one has just begun. Only time will determine if change is other than illusory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris, C. (1985). Strategy, change and defensive routines. Boston: Pitman.

Argyris, C. & Schon, D. (1977). Theory into practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Fracisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bacharach, S.B. & Lawler, E.J. (1980). Power and politics in organizations. SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baldridge, J. V. (1972). Organizational change: The human perspective versus the political systems perspective. Educational Researcher, February, 4-15.

Baldridge, J.V. (1971). Power and conflict in the university. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Baldridge, J.V., Curtis, D.V., Eiker, G. & Riley, G.L. (1978). Policy making and effective leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baldridge, J. V. & Deal, T. (eds.). (1983). The Dynamics of organizational change in education. Berkeley, CA: McCutchen Publishing Corp.

Baldridge, J.V. & Deal, T.E. (eds.). (1975). Managing change in educational organizations. Berkeley, CA: McCutchen Publishing Corp.

Benne, K.D., Bennis, W. G., & Chin, R. (1975). Planned change in America. In W.G. Bennis et al. (Eds.), The planning of change, (pp.13-22). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bennis, W. (1987). Using our knowledge of organizational behavior: The improbable task. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of organizational behavior, (pp. 29-50). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bennis, W.G., Benne, K. D., Chin, R. & Corey, K.E. (1976). The planning of change (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Berliner, D. C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. Presidential address delivered at the 1986 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Berliner, D. C. (1985). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, ( ), 2-8.

Bess, J.L. (Ed.). (1984). College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences. New York: New York University Press.

Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina. (1986). The education of North Carolina's teachers: A report to the 1987 North Carolina General Assembly. Chapel Hill, NC: Author.

Bolman, L.G. and Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Boyer, E.L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York:

Campbell, D. T. (1975). Degrees of freedom and the case study. Comparative Political Studies, 8 (July), 178-193.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Casteen, J.T. (1984, April). Research and state policy implementation. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Chin, R. & Benne, K.D. (1976). General strategies for effecting changes in human systems. In W.G. Bennis et al. (eds.), The planning of change (third edidtion) (pp.22-45). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cohen, M.D. & March, J.G. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president, (2nd. ed.). Boston: Harvard Buisness School Press.

Deal, T.E. & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). Corporate cultures. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Deal, T.E., Meyer, J.W., & Scott, W.R. (1975). Organizational influences on educational innobation. In J.V. Baldridge and T.E. Deal (Eds.), Managing change in educational organizations, (pp. 109-132). Berkeley, CA.: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Dill, D.D. (1982). The management of academic culture; Notes on the management of meaning and social integration. Higher Education, 11, 303-320.

Dill, D. D. (1980). Schools of education as complex organizations. In D. E. griffiths and D. J. McCarthy (eds.), The dilemma of the deanship, (pp. 177-216). Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Dill, D.D. & Friedman, C.P. (1979). An analysis of frameworks for research on innovation and change in higher education. Review of Educational Research, 49(3), 411-435.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 119-161.

Evertson, C., Hawley, W., & Zlotnik, M. (1984). The charateristics of effective teacher preparation programs: A review of research (Draft report). Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation, Education Analysis Center.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1986). Philosophy of research on teaching: Three aspects . In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd. ed.) (pp. 37-40). New York. MacMillan.

Fisher, J.L., Tack, M. W. & Wheeler, K.J. (1988). Profile of effective college presidents. AGB Reports, 30, (1), pp. 28-31.

French, J. R., Jr. & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of scoial power. In D. Cartwright (ed.). Studies in social power (pp.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitive research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Goetz, J.P. & LeCompte. M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Hall, G. E. & Hord, S. M. (1984). Analyzing what change facilitators do. Knowledge: Creation, diffusion, utilization, 5 (3), pp.275-307.

Hall, G. E. & Loucks, S. (1978). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. Teachers College Record, 80(1), 36-53.

Hardy, C. (1987). The contribution of political science to organizational behavior. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.) , Handbook of organizational behavior (pp.96-108). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hardy, C., Langley, A., Mintzberg, H., & Rose, J. (1984). Stategy formation in the university setting. In J.L. Bess (Ed.), College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences (pp169-210). New York: New York University Press.

Herriot, R.E. & Gross, N. (eds.) (1979). The dynamics of planned educational change. Berekeley, CA: McCutchen Publishing Co.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1985). All one system: Demographics of education-Kindergarten through graduate school. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1986). Reform? Higher education? Don't be absurd. Phi Delta Kappan, 68 (4), pp. 271-274.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Jonsen, R.W. (1986). The environmental context for postsecondary education. In P.M. Callan (Ed.), Environmental scanning for strategic leadership (pp.5-20). San Fracisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz,D. & Kahn, R.L. (1975). Organizational change. In J.V. Baldridge and T.E. Deal (ed.), Managing change in educational organizations (pp.35-75). Berkeley, CA: McCutchen Publishing Company.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. (2nd. ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Keller, G. (1988). Academic strategy: Five years later. AAHE Bulletin, 40 (6), 3-6.

Keller, G. (1983). Academic strategy: The management revolution in higher education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kent, J. (1979). The management of educational change efforts in school systems. In R.E. Herriot and N. Gross(Eds.), The dynamics of planned educational change. (pp. 239-

Kozma, E.J. & Walker, J.H. (1985). Using a policy classification model to analyze major changes regarding control and administration of policies relative to professional staff. ERIC ED 258 929.

Kozma, R.J. (1985). A grounded theory of instructional innovation in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 56(3), 300-319.

Lanier, J.E. & Little, J.W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd. ed.), Z(pp. 527-569). New York: MacMillan.

Lawrence, P.R. (1987). Historical development of organizational behavior. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.) , Handbook of organizational behavior (pp.1-9). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lindquist, J. (1974). Political linkage: The academic-innivation process. Journal of Higher Education, XVV(5), 323-343.

Lorsch, J.W. (Ed.). (1987). Handbook of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lorsch, J. W. (1979). Making behavioral science more useful. Harvard Business Review, 57 (2), 171-180.

March, J. G. (1982). Emerging developments in the study of organizations. The Review of Higher Education, 6(1), 111-18.

Miles, M.B. (1983). Qualitative data analysis as an attractive nuisance: The problem of analysis. In Van Maanen, J. (Ed.), Qualitative methodology (pp.117-134). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miles, M.B. & Huberham, A.M. (1984). Qualitaitve data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B. (1983). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. In Meyer, J.W. & Scott, W.R. (Eds.), Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality (pp.21-45). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). An emerging strategy of "direct" research. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), Qualitative methodology (pp. 105-116). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). A call for change in teacher education. Washington, DC: AACTE.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative in educational reform. Washington, D.C .: Author.

Noblit, G. (1985). Cultural change and political strategy in school administration. Delta 35,

Noblit, G.W. & Berry, B.W. (1985). Ethnography, organizations and dialectics: Exploration of a hueristic. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, Charlotte, N.C.

Noblit, G.W., Hare, R.D. & Berry, B. (1985). The politics of planning: Political clientelism in educational innovation. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago: April, 1985.

Peterson, M.W. (1985). Emerging developments in postsecondary organization theory: Fragmentation or integration. Educational Researcher, March, 5-12.

Peterson, M. W. (1974). Organization and administration in higher education: Socilological and socio-logical perspectives. In F. N. Kerlinger and J. B. Carroll

(eds.), Review of research in education, (pp. 296-347). Itaska, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Peterson, M.W., & Corcoran, M. (Eds.). (1985). Institutional research in transition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pettigrew, A.M. (1979). On studying organizational cultures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 570-581.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1987). Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice. London: The Falmer Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. , Tabachnick, B. R. & Wehlage, G. (1982). The myth of education reform: A study of school responses to a program of change. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Popkewitz, T.S., Tabachnick, B.R. & Zeichner, K.M. (1979). Dulling the senses:

Pressman, J. L. & Wildavsky, A. (1973). Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Riley, G. L., & Baldridge, J. V. (1977). Governing academic organizations: New problems, new perspectives. Berekley, CA: McCutchen Publishing.

Sarason, S.B. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston:

Schon, D.A. (1987). Educating the reflective practioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. SanFracisco: Jossey-Bass.

Van Maanen, J. (Ed.). (1983). Qualitative methodology. Beverly Hills,CA: Sage Publications.

Van Maanen, J., Dabbs, J.M. & Faulkner, R.R. (1982). Varieties of qualitative research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Weick, K.L. (1982). Administering education in lossely coupled schools. Phi Delta Kappan, June, 673-676.

Weick, K.L. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems, Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Weick, K.L. (1984). Contradictions in a community of scholars: The cohesion-accuracy tradeoff. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences (pp. 15-30). New York: New York University Press.

Weick, K.L. (1987). Perspectives on action in organizations. In J.W.Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of organizational behavior (pp. 10-28). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Weick, K.L. (1979). The social psychology of organizing (2nd. ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wideen, M. (1984). Program and organizational change in faculties of education: Some lessons for survival. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Wideen, M.F. & Holborn, P. (1986). Change and survival in faculties of education. Interchange, (1), 33-47.

Wildavsky, A. (1979). Speaking truth to power: The art and craft of policy analysis. Boston: Little Brown and Co.

Wisniewski, R. (1984). The scholarly ethos in schools of edcuation. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (5), pp. 2-8.

Yin, R.K. (1984). Case study research: Design and methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.